

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies in Great Britain, who have suffered three horrific terror attacks in a period of less than 3 months.

These attacks at the hands of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria are barbaric, evil, and must be condemned by the entire world. These cowards have used vehicles, knives, and bombs to rein terror down on London and Manchester, even targeting innocent young girls at a concert hall.

Radical Islamic extremism is a vile ideology that must be stamped out at every corner of the world. This is a time for unity of purpose and strong leadership.

The United States, our NATO allies, and our allies in the Middle East must chart a unified course towards complete destruction of ISIS. As we begin to succeed in the fight, their resolve to attack us will only grow stronger, but we cannot be deterred.

Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty must win over hatred and extremism. We must defeat this enemy, and this Congress stands ready to support this administration in its efforts to do so.

CONGRATULATING VIRGIN ISLAND STUDENTS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the end of the school year for students. And, of course, that means graduation and promotion celebrations.

I want to congratulate all of our students on their achievements and their proud family members.

To our teachers, faculty, and staff, we thank you for your continued commitment to educating our children. We know that there are many challenges in today's learning environment, but amid the challenges we face, you stand strong. We appreciate all of your work.

As a representative in Congress for the Virgin Islands, I pledge to continue to support legislation and initiatives that make our children, teachers, and administrators a priority.

To the students of the U.S. Virgin Islands, I have a message for you: During these summer months, please take this time to continue to learn, participate in the Governor's reading challenge, find a new hobby, work, and please explore the natural wonder of our home, the Virgin Islands of the United States. Be safe, and best wishes to you all as you continue a productive educational journey. Have a safe and fun-filled summer.

AUTHORITY OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult when Members rep-

resent different aspects or parties to really speak to what is right.

I just came from Europe, meeting with Europeans from a number of countries. I was passing through London in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic London Bridge incident. Many of us saw the courageous mayor of London speak to the people, along with national leadership.

So I must indicate my disappointment in the comments of the Commander in Chief of this Nation to bash in time of trouble Mayor Khan, a Muslim, who has stood against terrorism. Then, of course, the precipitous actions of firing Director Comey and the rumors of either firing or asking for the resignation of Attorney General Sessions gives me great pause for legislation like the Financial CHOICE Act that would take away the independent authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and make the head of that an appointee of the President, so the person who protects consumers will be able to be fired by this President.

With the words against the London mayor, the firing of Comey, and the threatening of Attorney General Sessions, I wonder whether or not we can tolerate any other authority given to this White House to be able to fire people who are to protect the rights of the American people, and to be able to stand for comments that undermine our allies and the friendships that we have established over the decades working to secure the American people. Let us think about it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 7, 2017, at 9:17 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1094.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board

of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN, New Mexico

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 374

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 374, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, and makes in order one amendment.

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, introduced by Ms. MCSALLY from Arizona, that will help ensure we have sufficient Border Patrol agents to secure our border. At this point in

time, where we are facing tremendous challenges overseas, where we are facing tremendous national security challenges, our Customs and Border Protection is understaffed and unable to meet the congressionally mandated staffing levels for Customs officers and Border Patrol agents.

With these ever-increasing threats to our national security, it is vital that we ensure CBP can quickly hire capable and trustworthy individuals to secure our border. Currently, prospective officers and Border Patrol agents are required to undergo a background check that includes passing a polygraph test. This process has been very long and has drastically delayed the CBP's ability to hire officers and Border Patrol agents.

H.R. 2213 simply provides a limited, voluntary exemption to the pre-employment polygraph requirement for State and local law enforcement officers that are in good standing and who have already passed a State and local law enforcement polygraph test, for Federal law enforcement officers who are in good standing, and members of the armed services or veterans who have received or who are eligible to receive an honorable discharge and have held a security clearance and undergone a thorough background check in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this exemption is very narrow and only applies to men and women that we already trust to protect and defend us at home or abroad: men and women who have already been through relevant security background checks. The CBP would not be required to use this waiver authority; and, if there is anything in any applicant's history that warrants further investigation, the CBP Commissioner is fully authorized and encouraged to use a polygraph test to resolve any outstanding questions.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the CBP has struggled to recruit and vet potential employees. There is no more urgent need that we have right now than securing our border and making sure we have the resources there to be able to do that job.

□ 1230

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense approach that will help address this issue and ensure the CBP has the men and women it needs to keep our borders and our Nation secure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 2213, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

H.R. 2213 would broaden the criteria for waiving the polygraph requirements for certain applicants at U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Under the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, the Commis-

sioner of the CBP would be permitted to waive polygraph requirements for certain State and law enforcement personnel who have passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement agents who have passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with three consecutive years in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the importance of ensuring that our Federal law enforcement agencies are operating at full capacity, but there are other big-ticket items that we are ignoring in this institution. So I ask: Where is the Republican agenda?

With control of both Chambers of Congress and the White House, my colleagues across the aisle have made it through nearly half of their first year in power without a single major legislative achievement. It appears that President Donald John Trump is more interested in slashing old policies than proposing new ones.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and congressional Republicans have yet to put forward the promised \$1 trillion infrastructure package. Voters are still waiting for the massive tax cuts promised to them during the campaign.

The American people have yet to see a single jobs bill, let alone the super-secret plan to defeat ISIS. And looming over this long to-do list is the investigation into Russia's blatant attempts to interfere in our election, an issue that many of my Republican colleagues seem more than happy to ignore.

Instead, President Donald John Trump and my friends across the aisle have spent their time rolling back protections for workers, consumers, teachers, students, and the environment.

Instead of tackling a bipartisan spending deal, addressing budget cuts under sequestration, and avoiding debt default, the Republican-controlled Congress insists on dismantling the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with a plan that will raise deductibles, lessen coverage, and leave 23 million more people uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, there are still plenty of people without jobs in this country. We have plenty of families worried that they will be tossed off of their health insurance plan, and we have plenty of folks who are pleading with Congress to pass compassionate immigration reform.

Yet President Donald John Trump is tweeting about his travel ban and attacking London Mayor Sadiq Khan hours after a terrorist attack hit London which, sadly, killed seven people and injured dozens more.

Mr. Speaker, after being the antigovernment party—and I find it hypocritical that people in the administration are declaring that we are obstructionists. They gave, during that period of the previous President, obstruction absolutely new meaning. After being the antigovernment party for so many years, it appears that the

congressional Republicans have forgotten how to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I welcome the opportunity to share the floor today with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend from the Rules Committee. I just would point out that, as a Congress, as a body, we have actually passed more pieces of legislation, gotten them on the President's desk, and gotten them signed at this point in Congress than at any time since President Truman was in office.

So it may be that my colleague is not in agreement with many of the things that we have done, but, Mr. Speaker, we have actually been working very hard to begin the process of recovery from 8 years of rules and regulations that have really strangled the people of this Nation.

We have passed, as the gentleman noted, healthcare reform out of this body. We repealed ObamaCare, and every single day we get more and more indication about the failures of that healthcare plan, with insurance companies pulling out of markets and leaving citizens all across this Nation unable to get access to affordable care. The Republican plan will change that.

We are also in the process and will, tomorrow, be voting to repeal the Dodd-Frank legislation, which has had a devastating effect on our community banks all across this country and on our communities, and moving away from the really misguided approach of the last 8 years that centralized power here in Washington, D.C.

One thing that didn't happen in the last 8 years though was the security of the border. And far too often we saw laws that weren't enforced. We saw people turning the other way for sanctuary cities, for example, and the failure on the part of the last administration to do what was necessary to make sure that we could know who is coming into this country and that we had the resources necessary to secure our border.

So I am very proud to be here today, to be able to debate this rule, to be able to debate the underlying legislation, which is sadly needed, so that we can get those resources we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

As someone who has spent their entire career and adult life in law enforcement, I know full well the importance of being able to hire quality men and women to provide for the security of our communities and our Nation at large.

H.R. 2213 simply provides the Border Patrol and U.S. Customs a tool in their

hiring toolkit to expedite the hiring of those who have already held some of our Nation's highest positions of public trust and who have already undergone the most thorough vetting available.

It allows Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have served in good standing for more than 3 years and who have undergone a polygraph exam to be eligible to have their CBP preemployment polygraph waived in order to expedite their hiring.

As a former sheriff who mandated—I mandated preemployment polygraphs in my own department. I have full confidence in thoroughness of the vetting conducted by State and local law enforcement agencies prior to hiring an officer. Those exams do not need to be duplicated by CBP in order to hire a prospective officer or agent who has already been vetted by their local department and has a proven track record of performance.

If CBP finds derogatory information on an applicant whose polygraph has been waived, then they still have the authority to conduct their standard CBP polygraph to determine whether that applicant should, in fact, be hired.

This bill does not lower standards. I want to say that again. This bill does not lower standards. It merely takes a commonsense approach to hiring by giving CBP the option not to duplicate a polygraph exam already completed by a highly qualified applicant's previous law enforcement agency.

I represent the Port of Jacksonville, which moved 82 tons of cargo last year and is one of only 16 ports of call authorized to move military cargo through our national security operations.

It is absolutely vital that U.S. Customs and Border Protection are able to hire enough quality officers to maintain the flow of commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The bill, in fact, does weaken critical screening of potential CBP officers, and our country actually should be working to increase the security relative to CBP. CBP is essential. It is our first line of defense to stop terrorists, to stop drugs, to stop dangerous persons coming in, and we should not weaken our standards.

Now, the overwhelming majority of CBP officers are honest, hardworking public servants. Crime and corruption has, however, been a persistent problem for the agency. Numerous CBP officers have been found to have strong connections to organized crime, including drug cartels. They are in prison now.

In many cases, cartels try and infiltrate the CBP by recruiting people to apply for CBP positions. This results in illicit drug smuggling and other dangerous activities.

In 2015, the CBP Integrity Advisory Panel found that—and this is a quote—“arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.”

In 2016, this same panel observed that “corrupt CBP law enforcement personnel pose a national security threat.” And it recommended that the current polygraph test be expanded, not reduced.

Now, this bill allows for an exemption for local law enforcement and former members of the Armed Forces from the polygraph requirement. For example, if a polygraph has been taken in the prior 10 years, I think it is a mistake to think that that will protect us.

In fact, the Inspector General at DHS, John Roth, advises against this bill. He explained that the polygraph changes, including this legislation—and this is a quote—“could put CBP at significant risk.”

He says: “While it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military.”

Now, it is important to note that, of the applicants for the CBP, two-thirds fail the polygraph test. That may be a concern, but we ought to be glad that people who are a risk are not actually hired by the CBP.

I will just note that the Government Accountability Office advises that, between 2005 and 2012, there were 2,170 reported incidents of arrest of CBP personnel for misconduct. That is about one arrest a day of CBP officials.

CBP's own Integrity Advisory Panel, and these are law enforcement experts, outside law enforcement experts, concluded in 2015 that “there is data indicating that arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.” And in its final report, that panel recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded to include postemployment tests that are best practices at the FBI and agencies in the U.S. intelligence service.

Now, I will just give you some examples that are real life examples from CBP, and this is from the agency itself. These are individuals who could be exempted.

An officer who, when faced with a polygraph, admitted possession of approximately 100 videos and 10,000 still images of child pornography.

A police officer who admitted to sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. An Afghan veteran who had classified information that he admitted he had taken out of theater.

An Army officer who would meet the criteria who admitted that he had re-

moved classified information from Iraq.

A police officer who admitted that he had smuggled marijuana into detention centers.

It is not too big a burden to ask that applicants have a polygraph test and be clean.

□ 1245

The Sinaloa cartel is recruiting people to apply to become CBP officers. Our protection is to make sure that we completely screen every single applicant so that the cartel is unsuccessful in infiltrating our first line of defense at the U.S. borders.

So, with that, I know that the authors are well-intentioned, but this is a serious mistake for the security of our country, and I urge Members to vote against the bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Rules Committee colleague for yielding. I am proud to support this rule and the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people sent a strong message: They want a secure southern border. Having a strong system of border security is critical to our national defense and the safety and the security of the American people. President Trump has asked us to get more boots on the ground protecting our border, and this bill is an important step in that process.

U.S. Border Patrol agencies are the ones serving on the front lines when it comes to border security. These hardworking men and women serve day at night at the border, at airports, and at sea and land ports in an effort to keep us safe. We should be grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, is woefully understaffed. In fact, the numbers show that we are short 1,000 officers and 1,800 Border Patrol agents. This shortage is making it harder to secure the border and help keep bad actors out of our country.

That is where this bill comes in. It would amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to provide necessary discretionary waiver authority to the CBP Commissioner in an effort to reduce the staffing shortage. The bill specifically would provide the Commissioner with the authority to waive the polygraph examinations in three circumstances.

The polygraph exam would be waived for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have held a clearance and passed a background check. These are three very tailored and specific circumstances, and these are exactly the

kind of men and women we want and need when it comes to border security positions.

Mr. SPEAKER, it is important to note that the waiver authority granted under this bill is not mandatory. It will ultimately be the decision of the CBP Commissioner to decide on a strict case-by-case basis whether to issue a waiver. The Commissioner can order a polygraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner can still order a polygraph for any applicant they deem necessary.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, and I hope to see more bipartisan support here in the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting a stronger and more robust border security system.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to be deeply concerned by revelations that Russia hacked last year's elections. In fact, just this week we learned that Russian military intelligence engaged in a monthlong cyber attack against our voting infrastructure, specifically targeting a voting software supplier and 122 local election officials.

This most recent revelation comes on the back of earlier determinations by the intelligence community that Russia hacked the DNC and distributed fake news in order to sway the election in Donald Trump's favor. This has been made even more troublesome by the fact that Donald John Trump recently admitted that he fired FBI Director Comey over the Bureau's investigation into links between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our electoral system is at stake. It is time the Republican-controlled Congress does its job and acts to defend our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan bill, H.R. 356, which would create a nonpartisan commission to investigate Russian interference into our 2016 election.

This marks the eighth time we have tried to bring this bill to the House floor. On the previous seven occasions, the Republican majority, regrettably, refused to allow the House to even debate this important legislation. But today, they will have yet another opportunity to redeem themselves. I hope they will finally put country ahead of party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today with a to-do list a mile long, and we don't have much time to cross items off that list. There are only 30 working days before our 5-week August recess. That is not much time, but those of us on this side of the aisle stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner with our Republican colleagues in order to make sensible reforms to our Tax Code, our infrastructure and healthcare system, in short, to work hard for the American people, because that is what we were sent here to do.

It is far past time for my friends across the aisle to come to the table ready to work on behalf of the American people in a bipartisan manner. We on this side of the aisle continue to stand ready to do so, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for his participation in this debate today.

I think it is important for the record to be clear and to be accurate, Mr. Speaker. This House of Representatives, in the time that we have been in session, has been the most productive House during the first 100 days of a Presidency in 30 years.

I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may not want to agree to that. They may not want to acknowledge that because Speaker PELOSI held the record previously when she was Speaker, but I am very proud of that, that we have done a tremendous amount for the American people in the time that we have been in session.

We have overturned 14 Obama regulations in this Congress alone, which has had a tremendous impact on our constituents. We have already taken steps that will save them \$3.7 billion in regulatory costs, 4.2 million hours in paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the communities across my home State of Wyoming, this relief could not have come soon enough. We are in a position today where we have faced strangling regulation out of Washington, D.C., for the last 8 years, regulation that was truly intended in too many instances to drive businesses out of business, to drive our community banks out of business, and to create a situation where Washington, D.C., was creating one-size-fits-all policies. But those days are over. This is a new day, and we take very seriously our obligations to put country ahead of party.

With respect to Russia, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, there are multiple investigations underway in the Congress. We on the Republican side—I think this is a bipartisan

issue—take very seriously the sanctity of our electoral process and will make sure that we get to the bottom of it.

We have got to ensure that we recognize and understand the extent to which Russian hacking was going on—frankly, not just in the United States, but around the world—and make sure that we do everything necessary to stand up against both Russian hacking, to stand up against the kind of Russian attacks that we are seeing on electoral processes in Europe, and, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we secure ourselves.

At the end of the day, that is what this debate is about here this afternoon. We have got to make sure that we all recognize in this body that there is nothing more important than the security of our Nation.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are at a crisis moment. We are at a crisis because, for the last 8 years, our military has been strangled. For the last 8 years, our borders weren't secure. We have had threats growing around the world.

We have seen the rise of ISIS. We have seen the rise of al-Qaida—the expansion of al-Qaida around the world into many more countries than it ever existed before.

We have seen the Iranians make steady progress towards obtaining a nuclear weapon under what is the most misguided treaty agreement ever entered into by any American President: the Iranian nuclear agreement.

We have seen Chinese aggression in the South China Sea. We have seen Russian aggression in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen North Korea attempting, on a near weekly basis it sometimes seems, to make sure that it has perfected and acquired ballistic missile technology, while they also work to make sure that they are able to put a nuclear warhead on those ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a very dangerous world. We are living in a world in which America's ability to defend and protect itself is under threat in a way that it has not been certainly since the end of the Cold War, and maybe even since World War II.

Defending and protecting this Nation, Mr. Speaker, will require, both, that we provide the resources our military needs to defend us so that we can, Mr. Speaker, get out from underneath the policies of the last 8 years, but it also will require that we secure our border.

This bill today on the floor will provide the relief necessary for the CBP to do what is necessary to keep us safe. We have no greater responsibility than providing for our security.

I would remind the gentleman from Florida that this bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, on a bipartisan basis, with sponsors from both sides of the aisle. It is crucially important that we take this step to provide the relief—and not mandatory relief, but the relief—that the CBP can use if it needs.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the range of accomplishments that we have had that I am very proud of in this Congress and the accomplishments still to come, I think that we have to also recognize that nothing is more important than the security of the Nation. This bill goes to the heart of that, to making sure that the CBP can do its job. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 2213.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 374 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused,

the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE
ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides a